

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

William Alexander Lee,

Plaintiff,

v.

Yellow Checker Star Transportation Taxi
Management, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00919-APG-DJA

Order

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint. (ECF No. 21). Plaintiff does not attach a proposed amended complaint as required under Local Rule 15-1(a). While the Court previously liberally construed Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint as his proposed amended complaint, the Court will not do so again here. This is because Plaintiff's motion to amend appears to be an addendum, rather than an amendment, to the complaint on which he is proceeding. But an amended complaint must be complete in itself, without reference to any prior pleading, because an amended complaint supersedes the original. *See Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th Cir. 2012). If the Court were to construe Plaintiff's motion as his amended complaint, that would mean that Plaintiff has abandoned nearly all of his factual allegations and has abandoned his Family and Medical Leave Act claim (the one claim on which he is currently proceeding).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint (ECF No. 21) is **denied without prejudice**. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a copy of this order.

DATED: September 24, 2024


DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE